

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

BRANDON D. BRADLEY, SR., a.k.a.  
BRITTNEY HARDAWAY BRADLEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

DANE CO. SHERIFF'S DEPT.,

Defendant.

ORDER

20-cv-49-jdp

---

BRANDON D. BRADLEY, SR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

DANE CO. SHERIFF'S DEPT.,

Defendant.

ORDER

20-cv-50-jdp

---

Pro se plaintiff Brandon D. Bradley, Sr., also known as Brittney Hardaway Bradley, has filed two lawsuits against defendant Dane County Sheriff's Department. These cases involve two different periods of confinement in the Dane County jail, one in 2017 and one in 2019. But they overlap extensively, so I screened them together. Dkt. 30.<sup>1</sup> I dismissed both complaints because they did not comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and I invited Bradley to file amended complaints. Shortly after I issued that order, Bradley moved to amend both complaints. Case No. 20-cv-49, Dkt. 31; Case No. 20-cv-50, Dkt. 30. Bradley's amended complaints are dated only one day after I issued my screening order, so I conclude that Bradley had not yet received my order when she drafted her proposed complaints.

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all docket citations are to the '49 case.

Bradley has already submitted amended complaints in both cases, so she may only amend her complaints with my permission. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2). Bradley's proposed complaints suffer from the same problems I identified in my screening order. So amendment would be futile, and I will deny her requests for leave to amend. *See Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962) (futility of amendment is ground to deny request for leave to amend). Bradley should submit new amended complaints as described in my screening order.

I also note that Bradley has filed complaints regarding both periods of incarceration in both of these cases. In the '49 case, her initial complaint, Dkt. 1, describes the 2017 period, but her first and second amended complaints, Dkt. 27 and Dkt. 31, describe the 2019 period. And in the '50 case, her initial complaint and first amended complaint, Dkt. 1 and Dkt. 26, describe the 2019 period, but her second amended complaint, Dkt. 30, describes the 2017 period. Bradley has several open cases in this court, and it is her responsibility to ensure that she files her motions and documents in the correct cases. Bradley should address the 2017 period in the '49 case and the 2019 period in the '50 case.

#### ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motions for leave to submit amended complaints, Dkt. 31 in the '49 case and Dkt. 30 in the '50 case, are DENIED.

Entered May 15, 2020.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

---

JAMES D. PETERSON  
District Judge